UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,838	02/08/2002	Johan Rune	040000-951	9584

7590 12/05/2005

Ronald L. Grudziecki
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER	
WILSON, ROBERT W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2661	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/067,838	Applicant(s) RUNE, JOHAN	
	Examiner Robert W. Wilson	Art Unit 2661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 February 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *4/30/02* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/26/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because there is a lack of descriptive legends for FIG. 1-3. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 1, it is unclear in this claim what nodes are between the source nodes and destination nodes. What is meant by "particular node in route", "node message is received", "node to which message is to be forwarded". Are these nodes the same node or different nodes?

Referring to claim 2, what is meant by "next node"?

Referring to claim 3, what is meant by "particular node"?

Referring to claim 4-6, what is meant by "particular node" and "node which forwarded message"?

Referring to claim 7, it is unclear whether the destination node is trying to correct the error of its own clock timing or whether the destination node is trying to determine if there is an error in the offset value of the timing. What is meant by "estimating error of offset"?

Referring to claim 9, is unclear whether the applicant is claiming one of the tasks or all of the tasks. What is meant by "task is page scanning, paging, inquiry, ..."?

Referring to claim 10, the applicant is entitled to be their own lexicographer but they need to define these terms so they make sense. What is meant by "subcycle of a clock"?

Referring to claim 11, what is meant by "subcycle of a clock represents bits 2-16"?

Referring to claim 12, what is meant by "wherein a message in the point in time is exchanged indicated whether the point I time is more or less than a half of a subcycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time"?

Referring to claim 13, what is meant by "wherein the exchanged point in t time is not more than half of a subscycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time"?

Referring to claim 14, what is meant by "the exchanged point in time is a point in time relative to a default subcycle clock value"?

Referring to claim 19, what is meant by "next node"?

Referring to claim 22, it is unclear what nodes are between the source node and the destination node. What is meant by "intermediate node", "either node from which at least one intermediate node received the message" , and "node at least one intermediate node forwarded the message"? Are these those the same node or different nodes?

Referring to claim 23, what is meant by "next node"?

Referring to claim 24, what is meant by "another node" and "each node"?

Referring to claims 25 & 26, what is meant by "a node"?

Referring to claim 27, what is meant by " a slave node" and "a node"?

Referring to claim 30, is unclear whether the applicant is claiming one of the tasks or all of the tasks. What is meant by "task is page scanning, paging, inquiry, ..."?

Referring to claim 31, the applicant is entitled to be their own lexicographer but they need to define these terms so they make sense. What is meant by "subcycle of a clock"?

Referring to claim 32, what is meant by "subcycle of a clock represents bits 2-16"?

Referring to claim 33, what is meant by "wherein a message in the point in time is exchanged indicated whether the point I time is more or less than a half of a subcycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time"?

Referring to claim 34, what is meant by "wherein the exchanged point in t time is not more than half of a subscycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time"?

Referring to claim 35, what is meant by "the exchanged point in time is a point in time relative to a default subcycle clock value"?

Referring to claim 40, what is meant by "next node"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3, 8-10, 15, 18-22, 24, 29-31, 36, & 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe (U.S. Patent No.; 6,731,939).

Referring to claim 1, Watanabe teaches: a method of sending a clock and offset between a Master or source node and a destination node or slave associated with a WLAN which has PICONETs which inherently are ad hoc networks per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

The master node or source sends or a master clock and offset or message to PICONET nodes which have a dual role as both a slave and a master node or a route between a source and destination. The clock and offset is received by each node in the PICONET. If node is both a slave and a master, it redefines the offset or accumulated offset based upon it relationship with the node that is receiving the message which can be either a slave in the same PICONET or a SLAVE is a different PICONET or destination node. The clock and offset is forwarded to each node or next node in route to the slave of destination node. The slave node determines the offset with respect to the master or source and the slave is synchronized using the offset per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

In addition Watanabe teaches:

Regarding claim 3, Master devices have different native clocks and a master can also inherently be a slave; therefore, the clocks are inherently independent per col. 6 lines 25-30.

Regarding claim 8, the mobile which is a slave receives a clock offset and performs the task of inherently inquiring the value of the offset and then adjusting the clock per col. 8 lines 33-35.

Regarding claim 9, the applicant is unclear as to whether the task is page scanning, paging, inquiry scanning, inquiring, or transferring a message without prior connection establishment. The applicant broadly claims "inquiring". The reference teaches that upon the mobile which is a slave receives a clock offset and inherently inquires the value of the clock offset before resetting the clock per col. 8 lines 33-35.

Regarding claim 10, the reference teaches 168 &172 per Fig 8 or predetermined number of bits which inherently is the offset in the master clock and the slave clock within a PICONET. Any difference in clocks is inherently a subcycle.

Regarding claim 15, offset values are inherently the difference between the master clock and the PICONET time or slave time per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

Regarding claim 18, the applicant unclearly claims "estimating an error of the offset determined by the destination node". The examiner has interpreted that the slave node determining the error between it's own clock and the master clock offset is the same as "estimating an error of the offset determined by the destination node".

Regarding claim 19, the active member address or indication that each node in the routed between the source and destination in the PICONET is included in the 168 per Fig 8.

Regarding claim 20, the applicant broadly claims "network adaptation layer message header". The examiner interprets, Fig 8 is a "network adaptation layer message header"

Regarding claim 21, the active member address or destination that each message is to be routed between the source and destination in the PICONET is included in the 168 per Fig 8.

Referring to claim 22, Watanabe teaches: network for sending a clock and offset between a Master or source node and a destination node or slave associated with a WLAN which has PICONETs or networks per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

The master node or source generates a master clock and offset which it sends as a message to PICONET nodes which have a dual roles as both a slaves and a master node as an intermediate node or route between a source and destination.

An node which has a dual role as both a master and a slave node or intermediate node receives the message and redefines the offset or accumulated offset based upon it relationship with the node that is receiving the message which can be either a slave in the same PICONET or a SLAVE is a different PICONET or destination node. The slave node determines the offset with respect to the master or source and the slave is synchronized using the offset per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

In addition Watanabe teaches:

Regarding claim 24, Master devices have different native clocks and a master can also inherently be a slave; therefore, the clocks are inherently independent per col. 6 lines 25-30.

Regarding claim 29, the mobile which is a slave receives a clock offset and performs the task of inherently inquiring the value of the offset and then adjusting the clock per col. 8 lines 33-35.

Regarding claim 30, the applicant is unclear as to whether the task is page scanning, paging, inquiry scanning, inquiring, or transferring a message without prior connection establishment.

The applicant broadly claims "inquiring". The reference teaches that upon the mobile which is a slave receives a clock offset and inherently inquires the value of the clock offset before resetting the clock per col. 8 lines 33-35.

Regarding claim 31, the reference teaches 168 &172 per Fig 8 or predetermined number of bits which inherently is the offset in the master clock and the slave clock within a PICONET. Any difference in clocks is inherently a subcycle.

Regarding claim 36, offset values are inherently the difference between the master clock and the PICONET time or slave time per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

Regarding claim 39, the applicant unclearly claims "estimating an error of the offset determined by the destination node". The examiner has interpreted that the slave node determining the error between it's own clock and the master clock offset is the same as "estimating an error of the offset determined by the destination node".

Regarding claim 40, the active member address or indication that each node in the routed between the source and destination in the PICONET is included in the 168 per Fig 8.

Regarding claim 41, the applicant broadly claims "network adaptation layer message header". The examiner interprets, Fig 8 is a "network adaptation layer message header"

Regarding claim 42, the active member address or destination that each message is to be routed between the source and destination in the PICONET is included in the 168 per Fig 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 4-6, 23, & 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent No.; 6,731,939) further in view of Sato (U.S. Patent No.: 6,128,318).

Referring to claim 2, Watanabe teaches: the method of claim 1 and wherein the bridging node which is a master node inserts an offset before transmitting the clock to the next node per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43. Watanabe teaches an offset is performed in the master node. It is an obvious design choice to implement the offset as a negative offset

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node creating the offset.

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the offset per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master node of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging node and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 4, Watanabe teaches: the method of claim 1 and wherein the accumulation is performed by a particular node in the route if the particular node is a master node with respect to a node which forwarded the message to the particular node or if the particular node is a master node with respect to the node to which the particular node is o forward the massage per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node creating the accumulation

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the accumulation per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging function and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 5, Watanabe teaches: the method of claim 1 and wherein the wherein offset value is added to the offset in the message if the particular node is a master node with respect to a node which forwarded the massage to the particular node, and another offset value is subtracted from the offset in the message if the particular node is a master node with respect to the node to which the message is to be forwarded by the particular node per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43. It is an obvious design choice to implement the offset as a subtraction.

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node creating the offset.

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the accumulation per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging function and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 6, Watanabe teaches: the method of claim 1 and wherein the wherein further comprising incrementing by the particular node, an offset value or counter in the message wherein the offset value counter is incremented by the particular node only if the particular node is a master node with respect to either a node which forwarded the message to the particular node, or a node to which the particular nod is to forward the message. per col. 2 line 36-col. 4

line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43. It is an obvious design choice to implement the offset as a subtraction.

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node incrementing the offset value.

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the accumulation per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging function and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 23, Watanabe teaches: the network of claim 22 and wherein the bridging node which is a master node inserts an offset before transmitting the clock to the next node per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43. Watanabe teaches an offset is performed in the master node. It is an obvious design choice to implement the offset as a negative offset

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node creating the offset.

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the offset per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master node of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging node and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 25, Watanabe teaches: the network of claim 22 and wherein the accumulation is performed by a particular node in the route if the particular node is a master node with respect to a node which forwarded the message to the particular node or if the particular node is a master node with respect to the node to which the particular node is o forward the massage per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node creating the accumulation

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the accumulation per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging function and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 26, Watanabe teaches: the network of claim 25 and wherein the wherein offset value is added to the offset in the message if the particular node is a master node with respect to a node which forwarded the massage to the particular node, and another offset value is subtracted from the offset in the message if the particular node is a master node with respect to the node to which the message is to be forwarded by the particular node per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43. It is an obvious design choice to implement the offset as a subtraction.

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node creating the offset.

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the accumulation per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging function and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

Referring to claim 27, Watanabe teaches: the network of claim 25 and wherein the wherein further comprising incrementing by the particular node, an offset value or counter in the message wherein the offset value counter is incremented by the particular node only if the particular node

is a master node with respect to either a node which forwarded the message to the particular node, or a node to which the particular nod is to forward the message. per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43. It is an obvious design choice to implement the offset as a subtraction.

Watanabe does not expressly call for: slave node incrementing the offset value.

Sato teaches: cycle slave node or slave node creates the accumulation per Fig 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the cycle slave node name of Sato to the master of Watanabe because it is another name for a bridging function and the master node of Watanabe is performing a bridging function.

8. Claims 11-14, 16-17, 32-35, & 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (U.S. Patent No.; 6,731,939)

Referring to claim 11, Watanabe teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the predetermined number of bits which are numbered from 2-27 with the least significant bit being 2 . The applicant does not expressly defined a subcycle but defines bits from 2-27 which inherently has a subcycle. It would have been an obvious design choice to number the bits from 0-27 instead of 2-27 as well as to define a subcycle representing the bits 2-16.

Referring to claim 12, Watanabe teaches the method of claim 10, wherein a clock offset of message is exchanged which indicates the offsets of the time between the master and the destination . Watanabe does not expressly call for: point in time more or less than a half of a

subcycle It would have been an obvious design choice for the inquiry of the value of the offset be inquired to an interval of a point in time more or less than a half of a subcycle.

Referring to claim 13, Watanabe teaches the method of claim 10, Watanabe does not expressly call for: wherein the exchange point in time is not more than half of a subscycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time.

Watanabe teaches: inquiring the value of the offset upon receipt of the offset value which is inherently performed within a number of clock subcycles. It would have been an obvious design choice to inquire the value of the offset within time which is not more than half of a subscycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time.

Referring to claim 14, Watanabe teaches the method of claim 10, Watanabe does not expressly call for: wherein the exchange point in time is a point relative to a default subcycle clock value.

Watanabe teaches: inquiring the value of the offset upon receipt of the offset value which is inherently performed within a number of clock subcycles. It would have been an obvious design choice to inquire the value of the offset wherein the exchange point in time is a point relative to a default subcycle clock value.

Referring to claim 16, Watanabe teaches the method of claim 15, wherein the value of the clocks are represented by bits 2-27 per 172 of Fig 8. Watanabe does not expressly call for: bits 0-27.

Wantanabe teaches: bits 2-27 per 172 of Fig 8. It would have been an obvious design choice to represent the offset as bits 0-27 instead of bits 2-27.

Referring to claim 17, Watanabe teaches the method of claim 15, and retrieving the offset values. Watanabe does not expressly call for: a host controller to retrieve the offset. The examiner takes official notice that a host controller is well known in the art. It is within the level of one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the method on a host processor because performing tasks on controllers or host processor is well known in the art.

Referring to claim 32, Watanabe teaches the network of claim 29, wherein the predetermined number of bits which are numbered from 2-27 with the least significant bit being 2 . The applicant does not expressly defined a subcycle but defines bits from 2-27 which inherently has a subcycle. It would have been an obvious design choice to number the bits from 0-27 instead of 2-27 as well as to define a subcycle representing the bits 2-16.

Referring to claim 33, Watanabe teaches the network of claim 31, wherein a clock offset of message is exchanged which indicates the offsets of the time between the master and the destination . Watanabe does not expressly call for: point in time more or less than a half of a subcycle It would have been an obvious design choice for the inquiry of the value of the offset be inquired to an interval of a point in time more or less than a half of a subcycle.

Referring to claim 34, Watanabe teaches the network of claim 31, Watanabe does not expressly call for: wherein the exchange point in time is not more than half of a subscycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time.

Watanabe teaches: inquiring the value of the offset upon receipt of the offset value which is inherently performed within a number of clock subcycles. It would have been an obvious design choice to inquire the value of the offset within time which is not more than half of a subscycle in the future at a time of sending the point in time.

Referring to claim 35, Watanabe teaches the network of claim 31, Watanabe does not expressly call for: wherein the exchange point in time is a point relative to a default subcycle clock value. Watanabe teaches: inquiring the value of the offset upon receipt of the offset value which is inherently performed within a number of clock subcycles. It would have been an obvious design choice to inquire the value of the offset wherein the exchange point in time is a point relative to a default subcycle clock value.

Referring to claim 37, Watanabe teaches the network of claim 36, wherein the value of the clocks are represented by bits 2-27 per 172 of Fig 8. Watanabe does not expressly call for: bits 0-27. Watanabe teaches: bits 2-27 per 172 of Fig 8. It would have been an obvious design choice to represent the offset as bits 0-27 instead of bits 2-27.

Referring to claim 38, Watanabe teaches the network of claim 36, and retrieving the offset values. Watanabe does not expressly call for: a host controller to retrieve the offset. The examiner takes official notice that a host controller is well known in the art. It is within the level of one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to implement the method on a host processor because performing tasks on controllers or host processor is well known in the art.

9. Claims 18 & 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe (U.S. Patent No.; 6,731,939).

Referring to claim 18, Watanabe teaches: the method of claim 1, and sending offset values which are accumulated in the message includes a clock offset value per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

Watanabe does not expressly call for: wherein the clock offset values includes frame offset.

Obtani teaches: clock offset values includes frame offset per col. 9 lines 1-4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the clock offset values include frame offset values of Watanabe because Obtani teaches that the clock offset values used to correct a reference clock can be used to determine frame offset.

Referring to claim 39, Watanabe teaches: the network of claim 22, and sending offset values which are accumulated in the message includes a clock offset value per col. 2 line 36-col. 4 line 4 or col. 6 line 17-col. 8 line 43.

Watanabe does not expressly call for: wherein the clock offset values includes frame offset.

Obtani teaches: clock offset values includes frame offset per col. 9 lines 1-4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the clock offset values include frame offset values of Watanabe because Obtani teaches that the clock offset values used to correct a reference clock can be used to determine frame offset.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Wilson whose telephone number is 571/272-3075. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen can be reached on 571/272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert W. Wilson

Robert W Wilson
Examiner
Art Unit 2661

RWW
11/29/05

BOB PHUNKULH
PRIMARY EXAMINER